NOTICE: This publication is available digitally on the SAF/AAD WWW site at: http://afpubs.hq.af.mil.

This checklist reflects Command requirements for Operations Stan/Eval Programs for AFSPC Space Operators at all levels to prepare for and conduct internal reviews.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS

This checklist has been revised to update changes made during the revision of AFSPCI36-2202, *Mission Ready Training, Evaluation and Standardization Programs*. This checklist is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed.

1. References have been provided for each critical item. Critical items have been kept to a minimum, and are related to public law, safety, security, fiscal responsibility, and/or mission accomplishment. Aster-isked critical items (if present) are those items that if not accomplished in support of primary mission could result in an overall MAJCOM/NAF/Wing assessment rating of less than satisfactory. While com-pliance with non-critical items is not rated, these items help gauge the effectiveness/efficiency of the function.

2. This publication establishes a baseline checklist. The checklist will also be used by the Command IG during applicable assessments. Use the attached checklist as a guide only. AFSPC Checklists will not be supplemented. Units produce their own standalone checklists as needed to ensure an effective and thor-ough review of the unit OJT program. Units are encouraged to contact the Command Functional OPR of this Checklist to recommend additions and changes deemed necessary. See **Attachment 1**.

WILLIAM R. LOONEY III,   Maj Gen, USAF
Director of Operations

Attachment 1

OPERATIONS STAN/EVAL (MAJCOM/NAF/WING)

Table A1.1. Checklist.

SECTION 1 - HQ AFSPC			
MISSION STATEMENT: Establish policy, basic requirements and provide guidance for standardization and evaluation programs.			
.*NOTE*: All references are from AFSPCI 36-2202, unless otherwise noted.			
KRA 1 - POLICY AND GUIDANCE			
1.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**
1.1.1. Has AFSPC established a MAJCOM office of primary responsibility (OPR) to implement evaluation and standardization programs? (para 1.2.1.2)			
1.1.2. Has AFSPC/DOT developed processes to establish and implement policy, basic requirements and guidance for operations evaluation and standardization programs across all command mission areas? (para 1.2.1.3)			
1.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
1.2.1. Does HQ AFSPC/DOT coordinate supplements, waivers and requests for clarification and guidance? (Instruction introductory para)			
1.2.2. Does HQ AFSPC/DOT oversee management of evaluation and standardization programs? (para 1.2.1.1)			
SECTION 2 - NUMBERED AIR FORCE (NAF)			
MISSION STATEMENT: Serve as point of contact for issues relative to their subordinate units and AFSPCI 36-2202.			
2.1. CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
2.1.1. Does the NAF coordinate guidance issues with HQ AFSPC/DOT? (para 1.2.7.2)			
2.1.2. Does the NAF Stan/Eval conduct visits to assess wing ability to meet mission requirements? (para 1.2.8.2)			
2.2. NON-CRITICAL ITEMS:	YES	NO	N/A
2.2.1. Does the NAF define specific roles and responsibilities for wings, groups, squadrons, and detachments to implement the requirements of AFSPCI 36-2202? (para 1.2.7.4)			

2.2.2. Does the NAF establish requirements for a standardized evaluator training program and ensure wings/groups implement the program? (para 1.2.8.1)			
2.2.3. Does the NAF process mission ready delinquency date waiver requests that do not exceed 18 months? (para 1.2.8.3)			
2.2.4. Does the NAF ensure standardization of operations among wings where practical? (para 1.2.8.4)			
2.2.5. Does the NAF supervise and monitor wing or group standardization and evaluation programs? (para 1.2.8.5)			
2.2.6. Does the NAF provide guidance to subordinate units for error determination when the wing is unable to make a determination? (para 1.2.8.6)			
2.2.7. Does the NAF establish Individual Qualification Folder (IQF) requirements? (para 1.2.8.7)			
2.2.8. Does the NAF publish initial, upgrade and recurring evaluation task responsibilities for each type of evaluation for each applicable mission area in the NAF supplement to AFSPCI 36-2202? (para 1.2.8.8)			
2.2.9. Does the NAF publish specific error assessment examples for each applicable mission area in the NAF supplement to AFSPCI 36-2202? (para 1.2.8.9)			

SECTION 3 - WING/GROUP/SQUADRON/DETACHMENT

MISSION STATEMENT: Implement the AFSPC standardization and evaluation program.

3.1. GENERAL (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.1.1. Does the unit Commander or Operations Officer determine corrective action(s) and follow-on training/evaluation requirements when real world crew performance is substandard? (para 1.1.5)			
3.1.2. Does the unit conduct all evaluations required by AFSPCI36-2202 and as directed by the SW, SG, or OG? (para 1.2.12.2)			
3.1.3. Are only certified evaluators or evaluator trainees under direct supervision of a certified evaluator used to conduct evaluations? (para 4.1.1.2)			
3.1.4. Are all required tasks/subtasks evaluated, as required, during an evaluation? (Table 4.1)			
3.1.5. Are evaluators restricted when required? (para 4.1.3.4)			
3.1.6. Are evaluators on restricted status for proficiency reasons prohibited from evaluating in a real world environment or from evaluating the deficient task(s) which resulted in the restricted status? (para 4.1.3.4.1.1.1)			

3.1.7. Are evaluators on restricted status for medical or PRP reasons limited to conducting evaluations in a simulator environment only? (para 4.1.3.4.1.1.2)			
3.1.8. Are evaluators decertified when they no longer possess the degree of proficiency or professionalism to be an effective evaluator? (para 4.1.3.5.1.2)			
3.1.9. Are scripts designed so they do not create actual conditions that could jeopardize personnel safety or cause damage to equipment? (para 4.1.8.4)			
3.1.10. Do evaluators ensure safety and real world operational requirements take priority over simulated activity? (para 4.1.9.1)			
3.1.11. Does the unit evaluation office develop programs as described in AFH 36-2235, Vol. II and AFSPCI 10-1202 for non-existent or upgraded space and missile systems? (para 5.1)			
3.2. GENERAL (NON-CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
3.2.1. Does DOV/OGV ensure development of evaluation materials for MR programs? (para 1.2.10.1)			
3.3. EVALUATOR TRAINING (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.3.1. Are evaluators trained, evaluated and maintaining currency in the tasks they evaluate? (para 4.1.1.3)			
3.3.2. Have all evaluators completed certification training prior to administering unobserved and unsupervised evaluations? (para 4.1.3)			
3.4. EVALUATOR TRAINING (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.4.1. Does DOV/OGV (unit Stan/Eval at GSUs) administer the initial and recurring evaluator training and certification programs? (para 1.2.10.2)			
3.4.2. Does initial evaluator training include all requirements defined in paragraph 4.1.3.1?			
3.4.3. Does the Chief of Stan/Eval (or designated representative) observe all certified evaluators conducting an evaluation at least annually? (para 4.1.3.2.2)			
3.4.4. Does the Commander certify all evaluators in writing? (para 4.1.3.3)			
3.4.5. Are decertified evaluators recertified by completing tasks as directed by the certifying official? (para 4.1.3.5.3)			
3.4.6. Do evaluators receive quarterly evaluator recurring training? (para 4.1.3.2.1)			

3.5. EVALUATION PROGRAM (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.5.1. Are upgrade evaluations given to an individual after completion of RQT or UQT for another duty position? (para 4.1.2.2)			
3.5.2. Has DOV/OGV accomplished recurring evaluations by the delinquency date or placed delinquent individuals on restricted status? (para 4.1.6)			
3.5.3. Has DOV/OGV developed performance tests to support evaluation requirements? (para 4.1.7)			
3.5.4. Are individuals recommended for training when UQ or when deficiencies are identified? (para 4.1.12.1)			
3.6. EVALUATION PROGRAM (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.6.1. Does the Space Wing/Space Group/Operations Group/Operations Support Squadron ensure standardization of operations procedures, training and evaluation programs, wherever feasible, among subordinate groups/units? (para 1.2.9.1)			
3.6.2. Are all new or changed publications reviewed for impacts on operations procedures training and evaluation programs? (para 1.2.9.2)			
3.6.3. Does DOV/OGV conduct visits to operational wing organizations for the purpose of evaluation program and operations standardization? (para 1.2.10.3)			
3.6.4. Does DOV/OGV ensure standardization of evaluation practices among wing/group/squadron CMR evaluators? (para 1.2.10.4)			
3.6.5. Do units maintain and document IQF information? (para 1.2.12.3)			
3.6.6. Does the Commander or Operations Officer direct or request recurring or special evaluations to check individual or crew proficiency? (para 1.2.12.4.1)			
3.6.7. Are the proper deficiency codes used to describe why an evaluatee committed a deviation? (para 2.2)			
3.6.8. Do evaluators conduct a pre-brief to ensure that scenario support personnel clearly understand the rules of engagement? (para 2.3.2)			
3.6.9. Are units properly documenting appropriate items on the AFSPC Form 91? (para 2.4)			
3.6.10. For units without approved T.O.s, is a stimuli list maintained to document entering arguments for each task/subtask? (para 2.5)			
3.6.11. Are squadron CCs/DOs observed by their next senior commander in the operational chain of command during all evaluations? (para 4.1.1.4)			
3.6.12. For BMR qualifications, is an observation conducted upon completion of qualification training? (para 4.1.2.5.1)			
3.6.13. Are all evaluations proficiency based and conducted in a crew environment? (para 4.1.4)			

	YES	NO	N/A
3.6.14. Does an evaluator only observe one evaluatee when administering an initial or upgrade evaluation? (para 4.1.9.9)			
3.6.15. Do evaluators respond to a real world status change as appropriate during an evaluation in an operational environment? (para 4.1.10)			
3.7. EVALUATION SCRIPTS (CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
3.7.1. Are scripts designed to prevent unrelated tasks/status from being introduced while a crew is accomplishing critical phases of Level A TEPS/METER performances? (para 4.1.8.9)			
3.8. EVALUATION SCRIPTS (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.8.1. Do scripts include instructions for evaluators, scenario support personnel, simulated inputs and problem cards? (para 4.1.8)			
3.8.2. Do scripts contain valid peacetime and wartime stimuli? (para 4.1.8.1)			
3.8.3. Do scripts comply with TEPS/METER constraints? (para 4.1.8.2)			
3.8.4. Are scripts written to ensure crews are not driven to perform train-only tasks? (para 4.1.8.6)			
3.8.5. Do scripts create realistic operational environments requiring the evaluatee to prioritize actions? (para 4.1.8.8)			
3.9. EVALUATION REPORTS (CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
3.9.1. Are all tasks/subtasks in which errors were committed that resulted in a UQ rating evaluated in a subsequent special evaluation? (para 4.1.2.4.3)			
3.10 EVALUATION REPORTS (NON-CRITICAL ITEM):	YES	NO	N/A
3.10.1. Do evaluators provide written deficiencies to the training flight within three duty days of completion of an evaluation phase? (para 4.1.12.6.1.4)			
3.11. EVALUATIONS - PREPARATION AND CONDUCT (CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.11.1. Do unit evaluators properly determine individual mission-ready status? (para 4.1.5)			
3.11.2. Do unit evaluators accurately assess critical errors? (para 4.1.12.2)			
3.12. EVALUATIONS - PREPARATION AND CONDUCT (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A

3.12.1. Are evaluatee pre-briefings properly presented? (para 4.1.9.4)			
3.12.2. Do evaluators ensure responses to evaluatee questions do not give more information than would normally be available, or prompt a response? (para 4.1.9.5.2)			
3.12.3. Do evaluators ensure scenario stimuli are presented as written in the script? (para 4.1.9.5.5)			
3.12.4. Do evaluators ensure evaluatees aren't challenged, corrected, or prompted concerning the evaluatees actions? (para 4.1.9.5.6)			
3.12.5. Are evaluation questions used correctly? (para 4.1.9.5.7)			
3.12.6. Are evaluations properly terminated? (para 4.1.11)			
3.13. DOCUMENTATION AND REPORTING (NON-CRITICAL ITEMS):	YES	NO	N/A
3.13.1. Are results debriefed as soon as practical after each phase of the evaluation? (para 4.1.12.6.1)			
3.13.2. Are all errors and deviations documented on a CAW/evaluation report? (para 4.1.13.2)			
3.13.3. Are errors properly credited against the appropriate JPR? (para 4.1.13.2.1)			
3.13.4. Are all tasks/subtasks exposed during an evaluation documented? (para 4.1.13.2.2)			